



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CONTROL OF THE INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS OF GERMANY ONCE MORE

FREDERICK W. ROMAN
University of South Dakota

The article by Dr. Cooley on "Control of German Industrial Schools" is before me. I, too, should like to make a few comments on its statements.

In my previous article I referred the reader to Lexis, *Das technische Unterrichtswesen*, pp. 17-25. The table in my article is patterned after Professor Lexis' table, p. 23. It was not planned to be a translation, hence I omitted the items which Dr. Cooley mentions. My reason for doing so was the fact that the schools which are under the Ministry of the Interior include one single institution for *Feinmechanik*, which is purely a state school. Such a school would not throw much light on our problem. The other schools included the *Fachschulen für Textilindustrie*. These schools have absolutely nothing to do with our question. To bring them into this discussion only obscures. It should be remembered that pupils on leaving the German public schools are in no wise prepared to enter a *Fachschule*. Dr. Cooley states that the Lexis' table contained one or more inaccuracies at the time the book was written, and that a number of changes have been made since 1904. Such statements are likely to be quite misleading. German schools have made great advancement since 1904, but no significant or marked changes have been made in the control since that date.

Further, Dr. Cooley states that the table deals only with the higher supervision of the technical schools of Germany. In this he is mistaken.

The criticism with reference to the schools of Baden is partly correct. There should have been added to my table the industrial continuation schools, which were put under the Minister of the Interior in 1905. The criticism implies that all the industrial schools were put under the Department of the Interior. Only the

one type of schools was affected by the change. The control of the commercial continuation schools, the continuation schools for agriculture, and schools for domestic science was not changed.

We must add that the industrial continuation schools of Baden are governed in the main by a board called the *Landesgewerbeamt*. This is not a local board. This board is composed of certain state officials and members appointed by the Ministry of the Interior. Direktor Sierck, editor of the school journal (*Zeitschrift für das gesamte Fortbildungsschulwesen in Preussen*), says that the local board is quite limited in its power. Speaking of the local board he says: "Seine Befugnisse sind durch die bestehenden detaillierten Vorschriften und durch das weitgehende Aufsichtsrecht der vorgeordneten Behörden ziemlich beschränkt."¹ Hence we see that local control by a separate board gets meager encouragement, even from this one type.

The change was made to establish a closer connection between these schools and the *Gewerbe und Fachschulen*. The latter are recruited to a limited extent by the former. The former aims to teach the mass of workers, the latter prepares foremen, superintendents, and captains of industry. Now if in this country we could put our industrial schools under the same control that such schools have in Baden, there would be some good sense in separating them from public-school management, because in that case one could be sure of intelligent supervision. It is not possible to establish such a connection with our privately endowed technical schools. The machinery of our state-supported higher technical school is not yet prepared to undertake the task either.

The organization in Baden can do this. There are quite a number of higher industrial schools supported by the state. The boards controlling them are specialists, and not politicians. There is nothing in the Baden law to justify a two-school board system here. One ignorant school board in an American city is quite sufficient. Two would be superfluous.

Whereas no great change has been made in control of the industrial schools in the last decade, it will be interesting to note a tendency to do away with the dual system in Saxony. The journal

¹ Sierck, *Das deutsche Fortbildungsschulwesen*, p. 68 (published 1908).

Die Fortbildungsschule (Leipzig), April, 1911, contains an article on "Der Dualismus im gewerblichen Unterrichtswesen." There the *Sächische Fortbildungsschulverein* and the *Sächische Lehrerverein* have both come out for a union of the two types of control. After giving the usual arguments for union, the paragraph closes by stating, "Ein Verschmelzung beider Schularten kann allen Beteiligten nur zum Segen gereichen." Then the article continues to give examples where the union has recently been carried through in such cities as Chemnitz, Plauen, Annaberg, and Zittau. The article closes by stating "Also der Weg zur Beseitigung des Dualismus ist gezeigt und beschritten."

What I said about the control of the schools of Württemberg was correct. But let us go more into detail this time. The highest authority is the Ministry of Schools and Churches. The next in rank is a board called the *Gewerbeoberschulrat*. This is composed of a member of the Department of Commerce and Industry and other members appointed by the King. The law requires this board to look after the higher supervision, as may be directed by the Ministry of Schools and Churches. The next in authority is the *Beirat*, which is composed of eighteen members appointed by the Ministry of Schools and Churches. This board is composed of certain officials of the district, directors and officers of higher trade schools, higher commercial schools, public schools, art schools, and representatives of various trades. Below this, each school has an advisory board.

In discussing the control of the industrial continuation schools, Sierck says (p. 68) in the book already mentioned above, "Wie aus dem vorstehenden ersichtlich, ist hier nicht das Ministerium für Handel und Gewerbe, sondern das für Kirchen- und Schulwesen die höchste entscheidende Instanz." He adds, "In Baden ist die Verwaltung des Fortbildungsschulwesens in ähnlicher Weise organisiert."

As stated in my previous article, the director of the public schools, being on both boards, wields an enormous influence. He has a life position, and politics do not influence his actions. He is always a well-trained scholar, and is usually the most influential man in the community. When disputes arise in everyday life, the

quarreling parties not infrequently decide to bring their witnesses and evidence to the schoolmaster instead of the court. Both sides argue their points of view. The schoolmaster renders a decision. That usually ends it. Thus without any legal authority whatever, he exercises an immense control over the grown-up folk. Why not? They were once his pupils and learned to respect his judgment, and to believe that his word was law.

My statements with reference to Bavaria have also been challenged. Let me quote again from Sierck (p. 70): "Die Sonn- und Feiertagsschule partizipiert an der Verwaltung der Volksschule, die gewerbliche und kaufmännische Fortbildungsschule steht als Nebenanstalt unter dem Rektorat der Realschule und die selbständigen Anstalten dieser Art stehen unter einem Lokalschulvorstand, beide unter der mit weitgehenden Befugnissen Ausgestatteten Kammer des Innern der Kreisregierung und in letzter Instanz unter dem Staatsministerium des Innern für Kirchen und Schulangelegenheiten." This proves that not all the schools are organized in connection with the elementary schools. Some are put under the rector of a *Realschule* ("secondary school"), others are organized independently under a separate board. All types are found in Munich. When I was in Munich I secured an official permit from Dr. Kerschensteiner to visit continuation schools, high schools, commercial schools, an art school, and a teacher's seminar. In all cases the boards including the rectors of the secondary schools were under Dr. Kerschensteiner. That date was 1910.

The functions of all these local boards are largely advisory. They have no such powers as are exercised by local school boards in this country. They can neither appoint nor dismiss teachers. They cannot plan the curriculum. Their chief duties consist in making arrangements with the constituents whom they represent to levy taxes, furnish buildings, heat, and light. The reader must understand that the Germans have little local authority in anything. They are accustomed to a paternal government. They are ruled by a highly centralized régime. Even the schools of all classes have the military air. Dr. Cooley says it is misleading for me to try to make it appear that the question at issue is a religious one. Let me refer the American reader to an authority that is

easily accessible. Read *Beginnings in Industrial Education* (Houghton Mifflin Co.), by Professor Hanus of Harvard University. On p. 150, he quotes a state school inspector who said, "The domination of the church is our greatest obstacle in the path of educational progress." Other similar quotations follow. Then again on p. 185 Professor Hanus says, "One of the most serious questions, which Bavaria and indeed all Germany has to deal with, is the one of freeing the public rural school from the incubus of ecclesiastical control." It is just this condition which led to the statement in my own book (p. 62) which Dr. Cooley cites. Dr. Cooley says that he thinks the continuation schools of Baden are superior to those of any other state in Germany. Many Germans have told me the same thing. When I would ask them how they explained it, the answer was invariably, "Baden is the most free from church control."

Dr. Cooley calls attention to the Prussian Conference of Teachers of Schools, that voted to retain the present dual organization. I have already stated that I talked with prominent industrial-school directors, who told me that the reason why they favored the dual organization was because that seemed the only way to keep the church from getting increased control. When I was in Germany, Massachusetts had the industrial commission to manage the schools. That led me to investigate the question of dual organization. I went to these same men who favored dual organization in Prussia to ask what they thought about the dual plan. They thought that a country not divided on the religious question would undoubtedly do better to have only one board. Further reasons have already been noted in the previous article.

Dr. Cooley mentions the official statement, which was given as the reason for separating the schools in 1885. The official statement was that the work of the industrial schools had a closer connection with the Ministry of Trade and Commerce than with the Ministry of Education (see *Zeitschrift für das gesamte Fortbildungsschulwesen*, May, 1911, p. 356). I was once confused over that official statement too, but these same directors assured me that the real reason was the existence of a constant fight between Bismarck and the clergy. Bismarck himself was at that time Minister of

Trade and Commerce of Prussia. The argument in his official statement helped him get the schools away from the clergy. The journal which I have just cited (pp. 356-75) gives a long list of extracts from speeches made in the lower house of the Prussian Parliament in 1911. These speeches prove beyond all doubt that the religious question is the main one at issue. Let me quote a characteristic extract from a member of Parliament: "Wir fürchten eben wenn Sie einmal den kleinen Finger in dem obligatorischen Religionsunterricht haben, dass Sie dann auch die Leitung der ganzen Fortbildungsschule in die Hand bekommen wollen." Toward the close of the article we read, "Vor allem wird der Religionsunterricht der Punkt sein, über den man schwerlich zu einer Einigung kommen wird."

In Bavaria it was the clerical party that forced the investigation of Dr. Kerschensteiner's work in 1910.

To argue for a two-board system in this country because of Germany's example, without giving the full causes for the separation, seems to me to be unfair to the American public.

May I add that Dr. Kerschensteiner mentions in his reports frequently that in the different stages of developing the industrial schools, it was found necessary to improve the elementary schools. Is it not clear that he would have been greatly handicapped if he had not had the elementary schools under his charge? Prussian reports state frequently that the industrial schools have improved only as the efficiency of the elementary schools has been raised.

If we had two boards in this country, there would at once be a dispute as to the cause of the inefficiency of the industrial schools. Each board would place the blame on the other. The people would join the contest. Instead of a united community fighting ignorance, we should have the scene of well-meaning people fighting each other.

There is no reason to believe that a second school board would know more about industrial schools than the ones we now have. In the last analysis the same power that elects the first board will have to elect the second. This whole movement of dual organization looks to me like a political scheme to increase the number of officers at the expense of efficiency and economy.